### International Symposium on Understanding Moderate Malnutrition in Children for Effective Interventions

**IAEA Headquarters, Vienna, Austria**

**26-29 May 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organized by:</strong></th>
<th>IAEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In cooperation with:</strong></td>
<td>Valid International, World Food Programme, Micronutrient Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>IAEA Headquarters, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of participants from Member States:</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of observers:</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of participants from developing countries:</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of participants from developed countries:</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of participants from organizations:</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of participants:</strong></td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. of countries:</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of organizations represented:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibits**

- NUTRISET (+Edesia Global Nutrition Solutions), Sight&Life, Arla Foods Ingredients, IAEA Department of Technical Cooperation, IAEA Nutritional and Health-Related Environmental Studies Section (NAHRES)

**Scientific secretaries:**

- N. Mokhtar, C. Loechl

**Assistants to scientific secretaries:**

- T. Becic, C. Wegner, A. Djermouni-Vierling

**Conference Co-ordinators:**

- K. Morrison, MTCD
- B. Keceli Meszaros

**Publication:**

- IAEA on-line Proceedings

**Outcome:**

- Papers will be published in a special issue of Food and Nutrition Bulletin with Dr Eileen Kennedy as Guest Editor
Evaluation Results

The data below was sourced from contributions from 181 conference participants.

**Part 1: Conference Organization**

- Information on the conference provided by the IAEA was
  - poor: 0%
  - fair: 0%
  - satisfactory: 18%
  - good: 55%
  - excellent: 32%

- The response from Conference Services to requests/enquiries was
  - poor: 0%
  - fair: 1%
  - satisfactory: 20%
  - good: 40%
  - excellent: 32%

- How adequate was the registration process?
  - not adequate at all: 0%
  - not very adequate: 2%
  - adequate: 11%
  - quite adequate: 25%
  - very adequate: 50%

**Part 2: Conference Venue**

- How adequate were the conference facilities?
  - not adequate at all: 0%
  - not very adequate: 1%
  - adequate: 14%
  - quite adequate: 30%
  - very adequate: 47%

- Sub-services: catering, banking and accommodation were
  - poor: 1%
  - fair: 1%
  - satisfactory: 22%
  - good: 41%
  - excellent: 31%

- How was the space provided for poster presentations?
  - poor: 1%
  - fair: 1%
  - satisfactory: 21%
  - good: 42%
  - excellent: 29%

- Friendliness and courtesy of staff was
  - poor: 0%
  - fair: 1%
  - satisfactory: 9%
  - good: 38%
  - excellent: 51%
Part 3: Scientific Programme

How useful did you find the compilation of abstracts on the USB stick?

- Not useful at all: 2%
- Useful to some extent: 3%
- Useful: 25%
- Quite useful: 34%
- Very useful: 33%

How well did the meeting meet its stated objectives?

- Not at all: 0%
- To some extent: 8%
- Well: 27%
- Quite well: 41%
- Very well: 22%

The time allocation for each session was

- Poor: 1%
- Fair: 12%
- Satisfactory: 28%
- Good: 45%
- Excellent: 14%

The quality of the scientific content was

- Poor: 0%
- Fair: 4%
- Satisfactory: 12%
- Good: 54%
- Excellent: 30%

The panel discussions were

- Poor: 1%
- Fair: 7%
- Satisfactory: 28%
- Good: 43%
- Excellent: 24%

How well did the programme cover the topics most relevant to the management of MAM?

- Not at all: 0%
- To some extent: 10%
- Well: 22%
- Quite well: 40%
- Very well: 18%
## Part 4: Personal and Institutional Benefits

### How well were your personal expectations on the meeting met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite well</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How well has your knowledge of the topics improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite well</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How relevant were the meeting topics to your routine work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not relevant at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very relevant</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite relevant</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very relevant</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How much will the learned knowledge be applicable to your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not applicable at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very applicable</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite applicable</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very applicable</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>